

1 CONCLUSION

2 For all of the reasons set forth in the Response filed June 28, 2006, in the above-
3 identified application, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of
4 claims 1 through 23.

5 If any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or if the Examiner believes a
6 conference might expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the
7 undersigned attorney prior to issuing a further action in this case.

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 The Culbertson Group, P.C.

10
11 Dated: 10 Oct 2006

12 By: 

13 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
14 1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420
15 Austin, Texas 78746
16 512-327-8932
17 ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
18

1045.Response.NNCA.wpd

selecting is merely during a bonus round, i.e., irrespective of whether the bonus round is a predetermined-prize bonus round. Regarding the claimed concealing aspect of the present invention, the Office Action apparently relies for the rejection on the teaching of Webb regarding a bonus round in which a player must complete a plurality of steps before reaching a win condition, at which point a gaming device provides the player with an award. Applicants submit, however, that while it is not crystal clear what Webb is teaching, it appears Webb is teaching about a so-called secondary game, i.e., bonus round, award that does not even exist until a player completes steps reaching a win condition. In such a case, Webb teaches there is no bonus round result that exists so as to be subject to concealment until the game player selects a selection option in a bonus round. This is contrary to the claims in the present application, which teach that there is a game play result that exists, is associated with a bonus round, and is concealed during the bonus round.

Furthermore, it should be understood that in the prior art it is conventional that a game play result is different than or modified by a bonus round result. Indeed, in a preferred embodiment disclosed in the present application a player is presented with the appearance of what is conventional, i.e., making a choice that produces a bonus round result modifying a game play result, so that the bonus round result is different than the game play result. However, the present application goes on to teach that the bonus round prize is actually the game play result, as explained herein above. Accordingly, in the claims of the present application it is a game play result that is associated with a bonus round and concealed until the game player selects one of the options in the bonus round. Thus, even if Webb did teach of a bonus round result that exists and is concealed until a game player selects an option in a bonus round, this is different than the "game play result" that is concealed as claimed in the present application.

- iii) Webb does not teach or suggest "the predetermined prize of the bonus round is determined by the game play result and the game play result is determined independently of the bonus round," as now claimed.

To even more particularly point out patentable distinctions, claims 1, 9 and 18 are herein amended. No new matter is added, since the original application provides support for the